DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 255 921 CS 208 819

AUTHOR Fredrick, Vicki
TITLE A Study of Revision in the 1984 Wisconsin Writing Assessment. Bulletin No. 5304.
INSTITUTION Wisconsin State Dept. of Public Instruction, Madison. Div. of Instructional Services.
PUB DATE Mar 85
NOTE 66p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Guides - Classroom Use - Guides (For Teachers) (052)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Assessment; Elementary Secondary Education; *Revision (Written Composition); *State Programs; Writing (Composition); *Writing Evaluation; Writing Exercises; *Writing Research; *Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS Wisconsin

ABSTRACT

The 1981 and 1984 studies of revision, developed by the Wisconsin Pupil Assessment Program, are described in this document, which examines how well students are able to revise their own papers. Contents include an explanation of how the 1981 and 1984 evaluation criteria were created; an overview of the results of the 1984 revision study for grades 5, 8, and 11; a summary of significant findings regarding the kinds, extent, and quality of revisions made; a discussion of the relationship between student responses to the questionnaire and the revision study; observations and teaching suggestions; and a summary of writing curricular and instructional recommendations. The observations and teaching suggestions section summarizes the observations about the revisions and combines them with teaching suggestions in the following categories: prewriting, surface features, information, combining and rewording, beginnings and endings, reorganizing, the total extent of revision, and the overall quality of revision. Appendix A provides a model for workshop design, while Appendix B shows the Wisconsin Revision Study Design. In Appendix C the revision study data are organized according to the categories of revisions already mentioned. It contains the kinds, extent, and quality of revisions compared with test scores; the kinds, extent, and quality of revisions made by males and females; and questionnaire responses compared with revision study results. (EL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED255921

A Study of Revision in the 1984 Wisconsin Writing Assessment

Prepared by
Vicki Fredrick
Wisconsin Pupil Assessment Program

Published by
Division for Instructional Services
John Benson, Assistant Superintendent

Bureau for Assessment and Testing
Tom Stefonek, Director

Pupil Assessment Program
Russell Allen, Chief

March 1985

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Harmatuck

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The Department of Public Instruction does not discriminate on the basis of race, sex, age, religion, handicap, or national origin.

CS208819

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study is the product of workshops held under the joint auspices of the Wisconsin Pupil Assessment Program and the Bureau for Program Development of the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. The DPI acknowledges and appreciates the contributions of the workshop participants.

Workshop Participants

Julie Bronson
Rhinelander School District
1984 Workshop

John D. Fortier
Rhinelander School District
1981 Workshop

Richard Hansen
Howard-Suamico School District
1981 and 1984 Workshops

Joanne Huston
Rio School District
1981 and 1984 Workshops

Monica L. Josten
South Milwaukee School District
1981 and 1984 Workshops

Marie E. Leonard
Eau Claire School District
1981 Workshop

Pauline M. Pray
Stevens Point School District
1981 and 1984 Workshops

Robert Skaife
West Bend School District
1981 Workshop

Neil Vail
Racine Unified School District
1981 Workshop

DPI Personnel

Russell Allen, Chief
Wisconsin Pupil Assessment Program
1984 Workshop

Vicki Fredrick, Assessment Specialist
Wisconsin Pupil Assessment Program
1981 and 1984 Workshops

Darwin Kaufman, Testing Services Supervisor
Wisconsin Pupil Assessment Program
1981 Workshop

Robert Kellner, Supervisor of English and Communication Arts
Bureau for Program Development
1981 Workshop

Ellen Last, Supervisor of English and Communication Arts
Bureau for Program Development
1984 Workshop

Elizabeth VanderSchaaf, English/Communication Arts–Competency Based Testing
Bureau for Program Development
1984 Workshop

Contents

Acknowledgments ii

Background 1

Development 3

Overview of Results 7

- Grade 5 7
- Grade 8 8
- Grade 11 8

Summary of Significant Findings Regarding the Kinds, Extent, and Quality of Revisions Made 9

Relationship Between Student Responses to the Questionnaire and the Revision Study 10

Observations and Teaching Suggestions 11

- Summary of Writing Curricular and Instructional Recommendations 18

Appendices 21

- Appendix A: Model for Workshop Design 22
- Appendix B: The Wisconsin Revision Study Design 23
- Appendix C: 1984 Revision Study Data 25
  - Kinds, Extent, and Quality of Revisions Compared With Test Scores 25
  - Kinds, Extent, and Quality of Revisions Made By Males and Females 34
  - Questionnaire Responses Compared With Revision Study Results 37

Background

Effective writing incorporates revision. Successful writers understand both the importance and the process of revision. For this reason, the educators and others who helped develop the Wisconsin writing assessment felt that it was important not only to determine how well students are able to write, but also to determine how well students are able to revise their own papers.

In the Wisconsin assessment of writing, students were not *required* to revise their papers. Instead, they were provided with the *opportunity* to revise and were encouraged to do so. It was felt that this "optional" approach would provide a more valid measure of how well students understand and apply the revision process to their own writing than if they were required to revise.

In March, 1981, the Wisconsin Pupil Assessment Program measured writing skills of randomly selected statewide samples of fifth, eighth, and eleventh grade students. A total of approximately 4,200 students each wrote responses to *two* exercises. One exercise required an impromptu response to be completed in one testing session. The other exercise required students to write a rough draft during one testing session, and in another testing session at least one day later, they were given the opportunity to revise their rough drafts to produce a final copy. This writing assessment was administered again in March, 1984, to random samples of approximately 3,500 fifth, eighth, and eleventh graders. The table on page 2 describes the writing assessment.

All of the impromptu responses and the final copies were hand scored.[1] The rough drafts were not scored, but respresentative samples of rough drafts with their final copies were selected at each of the three grades tested. Approximately 500 papers were selected in 1981 and about 450 were selected in 1984. These papers were evaluated in separate studies. The purposes of these revision studies were:

1. to determine if the students revised their rough drafts;

2. to observe and describe the kinds, extent, and quality of revisions made; and

3. to provide suggestions for teaching revision skills.

In addition, the results of the revision study were compared with students' responses to a questionnaire which they were required to complete as part of the 1984 assessment.

The procedures and criteria used for evaluation and the results of the study of revision are described in this publication.

---

[1] Each response was hand scored by two evaluation methods: primary trait and holistic evaluation. For analysis of statewide results and an explanation of the scoring process see: *1984 Wisconsin Pupil Assessment Program Report* published by the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction.

SUMMARY OF THE WISCONSIN WRITING ASSESSMENT

Grade	Exercises	Number Scored 1981	1984
5	Narrative Composition–impromptu Students are given a photograph of firefighters fighting a house fire and are asked to write a story inspired by the picture.	1,153	1,250
	Expository Essay–with revision Students are given a list of facts about the moon which they are asked to organize and incorporate into a science report. They are instructed to write a rough draft in one testing session and a revised final copy in a second testing session on another day.		
8	Narrative Composition–impromptu (same as fifth grade)	1,126	1,185
	Expository Essay–with revision (same as fifth grade)		
11	Narrative Composition–impromptu (same as fifth grade)	977	1,106
	Persuasive Essay–with revision Students are asked to suggest to their school board a change to improve the school and give reasons why the change should be made. They are instructed to write a rough draft in one testing session and a revised final copy in a second testing session on another day.		
	- or -		
	Job Application Letter–impromptu Students are given a newspaper help-wanted advertisement and are asked to write a letter applying for the job advertised.	985	Not Administered
	Persuasive Essay–with revision (same as described above–grade 11, Persuasive Essay)		

Development

Creation of 1981 and 1984 Evaluation Criteria

A committee of teachers and language arts coordinators from a variety of Wisconsin public school districts participated in the 1981 Writing Assessment Revision Study, a workshop held on July 20-24 at the University of Wisconsin Field Station at Pigeon Lake, Wisconsin. Along with staff members from the Department of Public Instruction, the workshop participants were faced with the task of systematically evaluating the revisions which occurred in a sample of approximately 1,500 rough drafts and final copies written by Wisconsin fifth, eighth, and eleventh grade students.

The rough draft/final copy exercises which students wrote were unique to the Wisconsin Writing Assessment, and for this reason there was no suitable evaluation procedure already in existence. Therefore, workshop participants had to:

- determine what aspects of the revisions were most important and appropriate to examine;
- define criteria upon which to base judgments about the students' revisions; and
- create a systematic method of capturing and quantifying the desired information.

Because the workshop participants had substantial experience in the instruction of writing, they pursued an inductive[2] approach to designing the evaluation method which was used in the study of revision. As steps in this process, the workshop members:

1. wrote rough drafts following the exact directions and time limits given to the students
2. revised their own rough drafts to produce final copies, adhering to the directions and time limits of the exercises
3. discussed their own writing and revisions, considering:
   - response to the exercises
   - effect of the exercises
   - types of revisions made
   - extent of revisions made
   - quality of revisions made
4. read a random sample of students' rough drafts and final copies
5. discussed students' writing and revisions, considering:
   - response to the exercises
   - types of revisions made
   - extent of revisions made
   - quality of revisions made
   - differences between students' revisions and participants' revisions
   - explanations for those differences
   - differences in revisions made by the three grade levels, 5th, 8th, and 11th
   - explanations for the differences
6. identified categories of observed revisions and developed procedures and criteria for the collection of information about these categories
7. identified other possible categories of revisions which had not yet been observed
8. read students' rough drafts and final copies to test the suitability of identified categories and the collection procedures and criteria

---

[2] A model for an inductive approach to designing a research study and a technical discussion of the Revision-Study Workshop design are presented in Appendix A.

9. discussed
   - how well categories fit the actual student revisions
   - how well data collection criteria and procedures fit the actual student revisions
   - extensions, limitations, and modifications necessary
10. defined final categories, criteria, and procedures
11. produced an evaluation form for the collection of data

The evaluation form, which was used for the 1981 and 1984 studies of revision, is duplicated on the next page. The form was designed to record the following:

1. general information about the essay;
2. specific characteristics of the revisions made; and
3. an overall evaluation of the extent and quality of the revisions made.

Description of Evaluation Criteria Used

General Information

The general information recorded included the booklet number, the holistic score, and the sex of the writer of each rough draft/final copy evaluated.

Characteristics (Kinds of Revisions and Evaluation Criteria)

Each rough draft/final copy was evaluated for various kinds of revisions. Workshop participants indicated whether or not prewriting was evident; the rest of the revision characteristics were rated according to whether they improved the final copy (+), made it worse (–), or made no difference (0). The revision characteristics are described below.

KINDS OF REVISIONS
Grades 5, 8, and 11

Characteristic	Description	Rating Scale
Prewriting[3]	Evidence of planning for writing with words, notes, fragments, outlines.	no/yes
Surface Features	Changes in legibility, mechanics, punctuation, spelling, capitalization, usage.	– 0 +
Information	Addition or deletion of factual information.	– 0 +
Combining/Rewording	Evidence of changes in sentence development, including combining and rewording.	– 0 +
Beginnings	Evidence of changes in introductory sentence(s).	– 0 +
Endings	Evidence of changes in clincher or closing sentence(s).	– 0 +
Reorganization	Recognizable structural changes in paragraphing to reorganize thought process in essay; creation of topic sentence in paragraph organization.	– 0 +

[3] Students were provided space in the test booklets and encouraged (but not required) to write some notes or develop an outline. For this reason, workshop participants decided that evidence of prewriting or planning efforts should be noted.

DUPLICATE RATING FORM

GENERAL INFORMATION			CHARACTERISTICS							OVERALL EVALUATION	
Booklet #	Holistic Score	Sex	Pre-writing	Surface Features	Infor-mation	Combining/ Rewording	Beginnings	Endings	Reorga-nizing	Extent of Revision 1-4	Quality of Revision − 0 +

GRADE LEVEL _____ EVALUATOR _____

Overall Evaluation

In addition to evaluating specific kinds of revisions, as described on page 4, workshop participants compared rough drafts to their final copies, and rated the overall *extent* and *quality* of the revisions made by each student. The rating scales are shown here:

EXTENT OF REVISIONS

5th and 8th Grade Scale 1-4

1 = No significant change or revision.

2 = Some evidence of change in fewer than half the sentences and/or paragraphs.

3 = Significant evidence of change in more than half the sentences and/or paragraphs.

4 = Evidence of radical revision with totally different rough draft and final copy papers; complete revamping.

11th Grade[4] Scale 1-5

1 = No evidence of revision; no single cosmetic change; mere copying of rough draft.

2 = Simple changes in surface features, information, rewording, addition or deletion of single sentence.

3 = One-third to one-half of sentences show extensive revisions with substantial changes in more than one area.

4 = More than one-half of sentences show extensive revisions including reorganization, changes in beginnings and endings.

5 = Radical change from rough draft to final copy showing change of approach, focus, ideas; final is a new topic

QUALITY OF REVISIONS

Grades 5, 8, and 11

\+ = Evidence of improvement between rough draft and final copy.

0 = No evidence of improvement or deterioration between rough draft and final copy.

– = Evidence of deterioration between rough draft and final copy.

[4] A separate and expanded scale was developed for ranking the 11th grade persuasive essay for extent of revision because of the nature of the assignment and the more extensive language experience of 11th graders.

Overview of Results

In an attempt to maintain comparability between the 1981 and 1984 revision studies, the identical assignments and evaluation criteria were used. In addition, many of the same evaluators participated in both studies. Overall, the results of the two studies appear to be quite similar, but, as in any study which employs human judgment, caution must be exercised in comparing such results over time. Such factors as slight differences among evaluators in interpretation of the criteria and application of the criteria to the students' revisions, introduction of new evaluators into the process of analysis, and the period of time which elapsed between studies could contribute to variations in results. Therefore, no timed-based comparisons will be presented in this report. Results of the 1981 study are available from the Pupil Assessment Program office.

The following is a brief overview of the results of the 1984 study of revision at each grade level. Observations and teaching suggestions made by workshop participants appear on pages 11-19, and data tables appear on pages 25-62.

Grade 5

Students at the fifth grade appear to perceive revision as merely recopying material with few significant changes:

- 74.6% showed no evidence of prewriting (planning for writing the rough draft by making notes, an outline, etc.);
- 37.3% did not revise surface features, 27.5% improved their essays by making surface feature revisions, and 33.3% made surface feature revisions which made no difference in the quality of the final copy;
- 77.2% did not add or delete information;
- 81.9% did not show evidence of sentence combining and/or rewording;
- 90.4% did not revise the introductions of their papers;
- 72.8% did not revise the conclusions of their papers, and 17.2% made changes in their conclusions which made no difference in the quality of the final copy;
- 82.1% did not reorganize their papers;
- overall, 15.7% of the fifth graders made significant or radical revisions, and 66.4% made minor revisions; and
- 26.1% of the fifth graders improved the overall quality of their final copies through revising, and 53.3% made revisions which made no difference in the quality of their final copies.

Grade 8

Like fifth graders, eighth graders tend to recopy their papers with few revisions of a significant nature:

- 80.4% showed no evidence of prewriting (planning for writing the rough draft by making notes, an outline, etc.);
- 64.1% did not revise surface features, and 21.8% improved their essays by revising surface features;
- 74.7% did not add or delete information and 14.6% improved their essays by adding or deleting information;
- 55.6% showed no evidence of sentence combining and/or rewording, 23.3% improved their essays through sentence combining and/or rewording, and 18.5% made sentence combining and/or rewording revisions which had no effect on the quality of the essays;
- 86.7% did not revise the introductions of their papers;
- 75.8% did not revise the conclusions of their papers, and 12.4% made changes in their conclusions which made no difference in the quality of their final copies;
- 78.2% did not reorganize their essays, and 13.9% improved their essays by reorganizing;
- overall, 8.5% made significant or radical revisions, and 72.5% made minor revisions; and
- 27.9% of the eighth graders improved the overall quality of their final copies through revising, and 50.3% made revisions which made no difference in the quality of their final copies.

Grade 11

Eleventh graders made more revisions than fifth or eighth graders. A marked increase in the numbers of structural revisions made, rather than surface feature revisions, is evident:

- 73.8% showed no evidence of prewriting (planning for writing the rough draft by making notes, an outline, etc.);

  29.5% did not revise surface features, 56.8% improved their essays by revising surface features, and 12.5% made surface feature revisions which had no effect on the overall quality of the essays;

- 46.5% did not add or delete information, 36.7% added or deleted information to improve their essays, and 12.5% added or deleted information which had no effect on the quality of the essays;
- 58.2% made sentence combining and/or rewording changes which improved their final essays, 24.6% did not make sentence combining and/or rewording changes, and 16.3% made sentence combining and/or rewording changes which had no effect on the quality of the final essays;
- 56.2% did not revise the introductions of their essays, and 31.5% revised their introductions to improve their papers;

- 40.3% did not revise the conclusions of their essays, 40.3% improved their essays by revising the conclusions, and 15.7% made changes in their conclusions which had no effect on the quality of the essays;

- 51.7% did not reorganize their papers, and 36.0% improved their papers by reorganizing;

- overall, 49.2% of eleventh graders made simple or no revisions, 31.3% revised one-third to one-half of the sentences in their essays, and 19.5% revised one-half or more of the sentences in their essays; and

- 68.5% of the eleventh graders improved the overall quality of their final copies through revising, and 26.4% made revisions which made no difference in the overall quality of their final copies.

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS REGARDING THE KINDS, EXTENT, AND QUALITY OF REVISIONS MADE

- At each grade, students who showed evidence of prewriting, received higher holistic and primary trait scores.

- Approximately 25% of the fifth graders, 19% of the eighth graders, and 26% of the eleventh graders showed evidence of prewriting, indicating that there was very little difference among grade levels in the percentage of students who did prewriting.

- In grades 5 and 11, girls were more likely than boys to show evidence of prewriting. At grade 8, there was no significant difference.

- At all grade levels, students who received higher holistic and primary trait scores were more likely to have revised their papers. However, the difference in scores for students who did no revision and students who revised were not as great at the eleventh grade as at the fifth and eighth grades.

- Compared to fifth and eighth graders, eleventh graders were more likely to have revised their papers. Approximately 80% of the fifth and eighth grade students revised their papers; about 96% of the eleventh grade students revised their papers.

- About one-third of the fifth and eighth grade students who made revisions improved their papers by doing so; however, about two-thirds made revisions which were unproductive, making no difference in the quality of their papers. In contrast, about 70% of the eleventh grade students who made revisions improved the quality of their papers by doing so; about 27% made revisions which made no difference in the quality of their papers.

- Fifth and eighth grade students appear to perceive revision as merely recopying their rough drafts with very few significant changes. For example, about 20% of the fifth and eighth graders showed evidence of reorganizing their papers. Many of the students at these grade levels who attempted to "reorganize" their papers simply moved or exchanged the locations of sentences or paragraphs, rather than restructuring them. Eleventh grade students showed a greater capacity for making structural changes with about 50% of them showing evidence of having made reorganizational changes.

- At all grade levels, the extent of revision was about the same for boys and girls.

- In general, girls who revised their papers were more likely than boys to produce an improved paper.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STUDENT RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND THE REVISION STUDY

Student responses to the writing questionnaire and results of the revision study were analyzed. The following represent some important findings.

- Students who indicated they write a paper more than once before they turn it in were more likely to show evidence of prewriting.
- Students who indicated they are good writers were more likely to prewrite than students who indicated otherwise.
- Over 90% of the students at each grade level reported that their teachers "usually" or "sometimes" ask them to do prewriting. However, only 23% of the students showed evidence of prewriting.
- The number of hours students spend writing in school is unrelated to the kind, extent, or quality of revisions made.
- Even though greater than 95 percent of the students reported that their teachers "usually" or "sometimes" correct capitalization, punctuation, or spelling, only 62% of fifth graders, 36% of eighth graders, and 70% of eleventh graders made surface feature changes on their papers.
- Students who indicated that their teachers are likely to make written comments, talk about ways to improve papers, or require them to revise what they've written were no more likely to revise their papers than students who reported their teachers did not use these strategies.
- There is no apparent relationship between the attitudes students have toward writing or the amount of time they write for personal enjoyment and the kinds, extent, or quality of revisions made by students.

Observations and Teaching Suggestions

In addition to evaluating students' essays, the workshop participants summarized their own observations and combined them with suggestions for teachers to improve the particular revision skills evaluated in the 1981 and 1984 Writing Assessments. Each grade level was treated separately to allow for the differences in language skills and experience between elementary, junior high school/middle school, and senior high school students. The following represent an aggregation of observations and suggestions made by 1981 and 1984 revision study workshop participants.

GRADE 5

Observations	Student Needs/Teaching Suggestions
Prewriting	
Prewriting efforts are not evident. Of the students who did prewriting, most merely jotted down one or two very brief notes.	Teachers need to spend more class time on the writing process, especially the prewriting stage. This includes motivating students, generating ideas and utilizing varied means to help students start writing.
Surface Features	
Surface feature revisions were used successfully by 27.5% of the writers.	Students can develop proofreading skills. Compositions can be improved by reading aloud, peer-group and self editing, student-teacher conferencing, and by eliminating workbook exercises.
Teachers correcting surface features on students' papers does not appear to be conducive to students correcting surface features on their own papers.	Instruction on surface feature revisions should occur in the context of the students' own writing at a point in the writing process when students are still free to make changes.
Students often used singular verbs with plural subjects (*there is volcanoes*).	
Many students were careless, misspelling words which were correctly spelled in the stimulus. Some students appeared to avoid using words which were difficult to spell, rather than to use a dictionary.	
Information	
Information can be added successfully by few of the writers. Most lack skill to delete unnecessary data.	It is suggested that ample class time be spent in paragraphing and in recognizing appropriate information within a paragraph structure.

Observations	Student Needs/Teaching Suggestions
Combining and Rewording	
Sentence combining and rewording were used successfully by few of the writers.	Students need to practice how to improve sentences by combining, rewording, expanding or reducing them. Students need to engage as well in free writing so that they learn to manipulate words and sentences.
Beginnings and Endings	
Beginnings and endings do not show evidence of strength.	Students require instruction in developing topic sentences and recognizing the use of clincher or closing sentences both within a paragraph structure and the essay as a whole. Students should practice writing alternative beginnings and endings for a composition.
Reorganizing	
Reorganizing as a successful revision technique was evident in 8.0% of the essays. Many of the students who attempted to "reorganize" their papers simply moved or exchanged locations of entire sentences or paragraphs, rather than restructuring them.	Students must recognize writing as a thinking process and paragraphing as the shifting from one idea to another. Students should read papers aloud so others can note where an idea changes, indicating need for a new paragraph. Students should practice moving sentences and paragraphs around in a composition to enhance unity, coherence, or emphasis.
Total Extent of Revision	
Only about 15% of the writers made significant or radical revisions. Nearly 70% made only minor revisions.	To lessen their anxiety about writing, students need to sense from their teachers the permission to explore ideas and meanings. Teachers should provide time for students to edit and revise. Editing and revising should occur at a point in the writing process when students are still free to make changes.
Overall Quality of Revision	
About 26% of the writers improved their essays through revision, however, about 53% made revisions that had no effect on the overall quality of the essay, and about 18% made no revisions at all. Students at the 5th grade appear to perceive revision as merely recopying material.	In order to produce qualitative revision changes between the rough draft and the final essay, students can be made aware of the *possibility* of making dramatic changes.

GRADE 8

Observations	Student Needs/Teaching Suggestions
Prewriting	
Papers generally showed a lack of organization, possibly because only 19.6% showed any evidence of pre-writing. Most of the prewriting that was done consisted of one or two very brief notes.	Students can learn a number of strategies for initiating a first draft. Some prewriting strategies are jottings, notetaking, asking questions, automatic writing, discussing, brainstorming, listing, experiencing, and taking field trips.
Surface Features	
Students presented final copies with large number of errors in spelling, usage, and mechanics.	Student self-editing, peer-group editing, mini-conferencing, and reading aloud are useful strategies for correcting final drafts.
Teachers correcting surface features on students' papers does not appear to be conducive to students correcting surface features on their own papers.	Students must understand that it is the *writer's* responsibility to proofread and correct the final copy.
Information	
Information was added or deleted successfully by 14.6% of the students; 10.6% added or deleted information but did not improve their final copies by doing so; 74.7% did not add or delete any information.	Teachers can offer instruction in recognizing appropriate information.
Frequently, students apparently copied definitions word-for-word from dictionaries without any citation.	Students given practice in paraphrasing will be able to use material from reference works without plagiarizing.
Generally students did not make inferences from given facts.	
Combining and Rewording	
Sentence combining and rewording were successful when used by 23.3% of the writers; 18.5% of the writers made combining and/or rewording changes which had no effect on the final draft.	Students can use sentence combining as a means of gaining flexibility in their written expression.

Observations	Student Needs/Teaching Suggestions
Combining and Rewording (Cont'd)	
Very few students used their rough drafts as a working draft.	Students need instruction and practice in how to use the rough draft as a working model for the paper. Also, the teacher must provide ample opportunities for applying revision strategies to improve the final composition.
Students tended to use simple sentences. Their papers were lists of facts, without transitions between ideas.	
Beginnings and Endings	
Few students gave any attention to revising introductions and conclusions.	Extensive practice in developing alternative beginnings and endings is suggested. (See added suggestions for this item under Grade 5.)
Reorganizing	
Paragraphing generally showed no logical pattern, and paragraph indents were made randomly or not at all. Indents often occurred without concern for the content of the paragraph.	Students need teacher guidance in using a simple topical outline and grouping details under main ideas.
	Teachers can assist students in designing paragraphs which correspond with the main topics in their outlines.
78.2% of the papers reflected no reorganization. This may suggest that students do not understand the purpose or techniques of revising.	
Total Extent of Revision	
About three-fourths of the writers made minor revisions, while approximately 9% made significant or radical revisions.	Ample time in class should be provided for students to make and comment on qualitative changes in their own and others' compositions.
Overall Quality of Revision	
About one-third of the writers improved their papers by revising; however, over one-half made revisions which did not improve their essays.	What is suggested as a final result of teacher intervention is that students not only develop the ability to revise, but also the attitude to feel comfortable in doing so.

GRADE 11

Observations	Student Needs/Teaching Suggestions
Prewriting	
26.2% of papers showed evidence of prewriting.	Through direct and indirect methods, teachers may encourage greater use of prewriting activities. Students can learn the benefits of prewriting activities and incorporate various types into the development of a clearer, more cohesive essay.
Some students merely jotted down a few notes, while others wrote extensive outlines.	
It was apparent that because of the topical interest of the writing task, students had done some thinking about the issues they presented.	Apparently, students are unaware of the benefits or strategies of prewriting.
Surface Features	
Although extensive revision occurred in regard to surface changes, 13.6% of such changes added nothing to the overall quality of the papers.	Given focused directions, students can render more attention to proofreading and editing techniques.
	Also, frequent class review of paragraph organization and applied uses of transitional devices are suggested.
Information	
About one-third of the writers improved the quality of their papers by adding or deleting information.	While students show adequate discrimination in selecting supporting detail, they need improvement in effectively organizing information.
Concern for tone and audience seemed to influence deletion of vivid, personal examples.	
Combining and Rewording	
Although 16.3% of the students made combining and rewording changes involving no improvements in quality, 58.2% made changes in this area that did improve the quality of their final papers.	Students would benefit from ample experiences in making quality judgments about writing. Teachers can develop such experiences by using the students' own writing to engender student awareness of sentence construction and variety. Instead of workbook experiences, peer-group editing and reading aloud are strongly encouraged.
Students seemed more conscious of making changes in this area despite a large number of sentence errors including fragments and run-on sentences.	

Observations	Student Needs/Teaching Suggestions
Beginnings	
56.2% gave no attention to revising the beginnings of their papers; 31.5% made revisions in their introductions which improved their papers.	Teachers must emphasize the desirability of developing an effective introduction and opening thesis statement. The student needs to consider a purpose for writing and a potential impact on the audience.
Efforts at revising beginnings seemed to be superficial reworkings, with attempts to be formal in openings.	Groups revision and individual rewriting of alternative beginnings are approaches designed to foster the need for and interest in "making new starts."
Endings	
About 60% of the students made revisions in regard to endings; however, nearly one-third of those who attempted to revise the endings failed to make any improvement in quality.	Students can summarize, paraphrase, and write alternative endings or précis for their own papers.
	Students can be taught to refrain from drawing conclusions too early in the body of the paper.
	Students must practice drawing conclusions from a developed presentation of specific detail.
Reorganizing	
Most writers who made reorganizational changes improved their essays by doing so. However, 51.7% of the writers made no reorganizational changes at all.	Students will need to work on developing the skills to critique objectively their own writing and its potential audience impact. Reading aloud and using the "buddy" system are ways to reinforce this skill.
Total Extent of Revision	
About half the students saw some need for more than simple revisions. This is encouraging even though extensiveness of revision is not necessarily linked to overall quality; that is, such extensiveness establishes no guarantees unless the writer clearly understands what s/he is doing and why.	

Observations	Student Needs/Teaching Suggestions
Overall Quality of Revision	
Although more than one-fourth of the writers did not improve the overall quality of their papers through revision, over two-thirds of the papers were improved in quality through revisions--ranging from a neater paper to one with radical changes.	Teachers will want to consistently develop a comfortable writing atmosphere whose tone is conducive to revision and to the exploration of radical changes in original drafts.

General Observation: A considerable improvement in tone and tact occurred between many of the rough drafts and final copies. This indicates a high degree of audience awareness by writers at this grade level. Teachers must continue their fine work in this area of audience awareness. It is clear that students benefit from such an emphasis.

SUMMARY OF WRITING
CURRICULAR AND INSTRUCTIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations for improving the teaching of writing in Wisconsin public schools were developed. These recommendations were based on an analysis of the results of the 1984 statewide assessment of writing and student responses to a questionnaire on the test. Participants in the Writing Assessment Workshop, held in October 1984 drafted these recommendations, which were subsequently approved by the Wisconsin Council of Teachers of English.

Program-Level Concerns

1. Writing instruction is more effective and efficient when a district develops a systematic program at all levels (K-12) and across all content areas.

2. Every district should develop and implement an annual writing assessment program involving the collection and evaluation of writing samples. Such a program is essential to curriculum evaluation and planning.

Instructional Concerns

1. Students will learn to use the writing process most effectively through modeling and guided practice. Telling students about the process is not enough. Teachers should consider writing with the students to model the process of writing.

2. Share sample papers with students and demonstrate how the strengths and weaknesses of the sample papers can be applied to the students' own writing.

3. Assignments must be presented in the context of purpose and audience. Students need practice with a wide variety of authentic purposes and audiences in order to develop as writers. The teacher should not be the sole audience. Writing for different audiences requires different strategies and skills. Writing for an audience reinforces the fact that writing is communicating.

4. The selection of writing topics is extremely important. For this reason, teachers should give careful consideration to students' background knowledges and interests when they choose writing assignments.

5. Teachers should encourage and provide time for personal writing (journals, letters, freewriting, poetry, diaries) to enhance writing as a means of personal expression and discovery.

6. To be helpful to the student, the evaluation of writing must be specific to the instructional purpose and the student's level of development. Teachers should employ a variety of evaluation techniques, including holistic, primary trait, and analytic methods. Effective instruction does not require the teacher to evaluate every writing assignment given to students.

7. Effective instruction provides for prewriting:

   - Students should acquire a diverse repertoire of prewriting strategies, including freewriting, questioning, note-taking, brainstorming, conceptual mapping, outlining, discussion, and creative dramatics. Class time spent on preparation for writing is worthwhile.

   - Students are more likely to employ prewriting if teachers take ample time for modeling and guided practice.

8. Effective instruction provides for revision:

   - Students need to learn to distinguish between revising and copyediting.

   - Early in the revision process, students should be taught to look beyond word-level corrections to matters of purpose, audience, organization, and tone.

   - Teachers should employ a variety of revision techniques, including conferencing, peer editing, and using checklists, guides, and reference materials such as dictionaries and handbooks.

   - Having teachers do extensive copyediting on final drafts does not lead to students' learning usage and mechanics. Instruction on these surface features of language should occur in the context of the students' own writing at a point in the process when students are still free to make changes.

   - Revision guides should be specific to the assignment. When used for peer editing, they should emphasize description and interpretation rather than evaluation.

9. Effective instruction in the writing process helps to create more positive attitudes toward writing. Such attitudes correlate with success in writing.

Professional Concerns

1. Inservice training is essential to a successful districtwide writing program. Research and pedagogy in writing have changed so dramatically in recent years that few teachers have had appropriate preservice training in the teaching of writing.

2. Effective writing instruction takes time. Teachers can improve the quality of writing if their class loads and associated responsibilities are reasonable. The National Council of Teachers of English recommends a class size of no more than 25, with secondary teachers limited to 100 students. Teachers need two hours per day for planning, reading, and responding to student writing.

Appendices

Appendix A

MODEL FOR WORKSHOP DESIGN

The paradigm which seemed most appropriate for the Revision Study Workshop was that of naturalistic inquiry. Guba and Lincoln[1] provide clarification and elaboration of the concepts and constructs of this methodology. For the purpose of deciding what revision means and how it is to be evaluated, the task is deciding upon the important categories within the conceptual domain of writing and determining how to judge student revisions with respect to these categories. Two concepts useful to thinking about the problem of category creation were: boundary establishment and focus finding.

"Bounding problems relate to the task of establishing the boundaries of an inquiry as a whole."[2] The purpose of bounding is to determine which elements of writing are pertinent to the revision question and which are not. The issue of focusing arises because of the need to collect, analyze, and categorize participants' experiences within the established boundaries. Within the concept of focus are two sub-concepts, convergence and divergence. Convergence engenders a two-step process: identification of issues related to revision and the colleciton of data. The first step of the process has three facets: categorizing, prioritizing and testing the categories for completeness.

The test for completeness yields the concept of divergence or the identified other categories which should be included. Three strategies are available for accomplishing this identification: extending, bridging, or surfacing. Each of these three involves a hypothesis formulation-hypothesis testing paradigm. The result of extending would be to create a category which contains all the elements in x but also some new elements which when added to x create y. Bridging strategy requires that elements be found which link unrelated elements. The hypothesis here may be about relationships among elements or about other elements. For example, one may have a set of elements which appear faintly related to one another but they do not form a clearly defensible category. Bridging, then, would attempt either to find some missing elements which would then result in a more cohesive category or, alternately, another relational concept might be conjured which would better describe the common characteristics of the previously existing categories. Surfacing deals with completely new categories. The process by which new category constructs are formulated and tested is surfacing. The three strategies of divergence are hardly ever mutually exclusive, often occur in concert with one other, and serve as the stimulus for each other. The three of them are the means by which the initial categories are extended or altered as a result of divergence strategies.

The data which will lead to the conclusions is collected based on the design parameters of focus and boundary. The preliminary data processing delineates the information which is to be collected and analyzed as the central focus of the study.

---

[1] Guba, E.G., and Lincoln, Y.S., *Effective Evaluation*, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, 1981.

[2] Ibid.

Appendix B

THE WISCONSIN REVISION STUDY DESIGN

For this writing revision study the only needed design component was the schema for capturing the information about the identified categories. In this study two dimensions were necessary to capture relevant information about a category. In addition to indicating that a particular category actually applied to a given revision, it was also necessary to determine the quality of the revision and the extent of changes from the first to the second draft, across all categories.

The step-by-step process of the revision study is listed in Figure 1. Because of the emergent nature of the study design, its initial stages aimed to have the workshop participants immersed in writing and revision. Each individual was asked to write a response to the same assignments given to the students in the 1981 state writing assessment. The workshop participants were divided among the three levels of the assessment, required to write an initial draft and a revised final draft. After this task was finished, participants, grouped according to their assessment level, were asked to discuss their experience focusing on the items listed under 2 in Figure 1.

After these discussions the participants each selected a few essays and read them to understand the nature of the revision process as accomplished by the assessment subjects. At the conclusion of these readings, the three assessment level groups discussed their findings. Small group discussions were followed by a meeting of the large group.[1]

The primary purpose of these activities was bounding the categories. However, there was considerable attention to focusing issues, particularly convergence. By the time the workshop design called for the formal production of categories (step 4) each of the three groups had already made such a list. Their subsequent activities were aimed at divergence. As a result of discussion, tryout and further discussion a formal schema was completed.

This schema was used by each group to rate ten papers at the three assessment levels. The members of each group critiqued the schema, arriving at consensus for procedures of rating the several categories as well as extent and quality of revisions. These categories are described on pages 4-7. The format for the rating sheet is located on page 5.

While the processes of the revision study workshop have been discussed only briefly all of the strategies anticipated by the model were observed to occur in the workshop. The hypothesis testing paradigm of divergence was commonly observed during the establishment of the revision categories. These mental strategies seem to occur naturally for the participants with little formal intervention from workshop staff. The design resulted in precisely the type of product it had anticipated.

Figure 1

Steps in the Process of the Revision Study

1. Participants write essays based on assessment assignments. They should adhere to the time limits and directions of the assessment.

2. Participants revise essays to produce final copies.

---

[1] The considerations of these conversations are listed under 5 in Figure 1.

3. Participants discuss their writing and revision, considering:

   response to assignment
   effect of assignment
   types of changes
   extent of changes
   quality of changes
   how various age groups may respond

4. Read a random sample of students' drafts and revisions.

5. Discuss students' writing, paying attention to:

   response to the assignment types of changes
   extent of changes
   quality of changes
   differences between observed changes and those of participants
   explanations for those differences
   differences between changes made by the several age groups
   explanation for the differences

6. Present the notion of convergence.
   (i.e., need to identify categories of changes and develop procedures for collection of information about changes–extent, quality)

7. Brainstorm some initial categories.

8. Present notion of divergence.
   (i.e., need to hypothesize existing elements of categories or categories themselves which have not been identified and search for them)

9. Read for convergence and divergence.

10. Re-examine existing categories.

11. Discuss:

    how well categories fit the data
    need for extension and/or modification
    effectiveness of attempts at divergence
    procedures for judging extent and quality within categories

12. Define final categories.

13. Define procedures for judging extent and quality.

14. Read essays to determine:

    kind
    extent
    quality

Appendix C

1984 REVISION STUDY DATA

Because of the vast quantity of Revision Study data (over 385 tables), Appendix C contains only selected significant data pertaining to three aspects of the 1984 Revision Study:

1. data for all nine evaluation categories included in the Revision Study compared with mean test scores;
2. data for males and females for selected categories of the Revision Study; and
3. data for selected categories of the Revision Study compared with selected questionnarie responses.

All data not presented here are available for review at the Wisconsin Pupil Assessment Program office.

KINDS, EXTENT, and QUALITY OF REVISIONS COMPARED WITH TEST SCORES

1. Prewriting

Evidence of planning for writing demonstrated by notes, words, sentence fragments, outlines, or other techniques.

Grades 5, 8, and 11

PREWRITING	Percent of Responses	Number of Responses	Mean Holistic Score, Ex. #2	Mean Primary Trait Score, Ex. #2
Grade 5				
Evidence of Prewriting	25.4%	114	4.2	2.2
No Evidence of Prewriting	74.6%	334	3.9	1.9
TOTAL	100.0%	448	(State Mean = 3.9)	(State Mean = 2.0)
Grade 8				
Evidence of Prewriting	19.6%	90	5.2	2.6
No Evidence of Prewriting	80.4%	369	4.9	2.5
TOTAL	100.0%	459	(State Mean = 5.1)	(State Mean = 2.5)
Grade 11				
Evidence of Prewriting	26.2%	117	5.4	3.1
No Evidence of Prewriting	73.8%	330	4.7	2.8
TOTAL	100.0%	447	(State Mean = 4.8)	(State Mean = 2.7)

2. Surface Features

Evidence of revision through changes in legibility, spelling, capitalization, and usage.

Grades 5, 8, and 11

EFFECT OF SURFACE FEATURE CHANGES ON FINAL DRAFT	Percent of Responses	Number of Responses	Mean Holistic Score, Ex. #2	Mean Primary Trait Score, Ex. #2
Grade 5				
Improvement	27.5%	123	4.3	2.2
No Difference	33.3%	149	3.9	2.1
Deterioration	2.0%	9	3.6	1.9
No Surface Feature Changes Made	37.3%	167	3.7	1.8
TOTAL	100.1%	448	(State Mean = 3.9)	(State Mean = 2.0)
Grade 8				
Improvement	21.8%	100	5.3	2.7
No Difference	10.5%	48	4.9	2.4
Deterioration	3.7%	17	4.6	2.5
No Surface Feature Changes Made	64.1%	294	4.9	2.5
TOTAL	100.1%	459	(State Mean = 5.1)	(State Mean = 2.5)
Grade 11				
Improvement	56.8%	254	5.1	3.0
No Difference	12.5%	56	4.4	2.6
Deterioration	1.1%	5	4.7	2.8
No Surface Feature Changes Made	29.5%	132	4.7	2.8
TOTAL	99.9%	447	(State Mean = 4.8)	(State Mean = 2.7)

3. Information

Evidence of the addition or deletion of information.

Grades 5, 8, and 11

EFFECT OF ADDING/DELETING INFORMATION ON FINAL DRAFT	Percent of Responses	Number of Responses	Mean Holistic Score, Ex. #2	Mean Primary Trait Score, Ex. #2
Grade 5				
Improvement	10.3%	46	4.3	2.1
No Difference	11.2%	50	3.8	1.9
Deterioration	1.3%	6	3.3	1.7
No Changes of Information Made	77.2%	346	3.9	2.0
TOTAL	100.0%	448	(State Mean = 3.9)	(State Mean = 2.0)
Grade 8				
Improvement	14.6%	67	5.5	2.8
No Difference	5.2%	24	5.1	2.6
Deterioration	5.4%	25	4.7	2.4
No Changes of Information Made	74.7%	343	4.9	2.5
TOTAL	99.9%	459	(State Mean = 5.1)	(State Mean = 2.5)
Grade 11				
Improvement	36.7%	164	5.2	3.0
No Difference	12.5%	56	4.4	2.7
Deterioration	4.3%	19	4.2	2.7
No Changes of Information Made	46.5%	208	4.8	2.9
TOTAL	100.0%	447	(State Mean = 4.8)	(State Mean = 2.7)

4. Combining/Rewording

Evidence of sentence changes by combining and/or rewording.

Grades 5, 8, and 11

EFFECT OF COMBINING/REWORDING ON FINAL DRAFT	Percent of Responses	Number of Responses	Mean Holistic Score, Ex. #2	Mean Primary Trait Score, Ex. #2
Grade 5				
Improvement	9.6%	43	4.5	2.2
No Difference	8.0%	36	4.1	2.3
Deterioration	.4%	2	3.0	2.5
No Evidence of Combining/Rewording	81.9%	367	3.9	2.0
TOTAL	99.9%	448	(State Mean = 3.9)	(State Mean = 2.0)
Grade 8				
Improvement	23.3%	107	5.4	2.7
No Difference	18.5%	85	4.8	2.5
Deterioration	2.6%	12	4.9	2.5
No Evidence of Combining/Reword.	55.6%	255	4.9	2.5
TOTAL	100.0%	459	(State Mean = 5.1)	(State Mean = 2.5)
Grade 11				
Improvement	58.2%	260	5.2	3.0
No Difference	16.3%	73	4.4	2.7
Deterioration	.9%	4	3.4	2.3
No Evidence of Combining/Rewording	24.6%	110	4.6	2.8
TOTAL	100.0%	447	(State Mean = 4.8)	(State Mean = 2.7)

5. Beginnings

Evidence of changing introduction.

Grades 5, 8, and 11

EFFECT OF CHANGING INTRODUCTION ON FINAL DRAFT	Percent of Responses	Number of Responses	Mean Holistic Score, Ex. #2	Mean Primary Trait Score, Ex. #2
Grade 5				
Improvement	4.7%	21	4.2	2.2
No Difference	4.5%	20	4.0	2.0
Deterioration	.4%	2	2.8	1.0
No Change in Introduction	90.4%	405	3.9	2.0
TOTAL	100.0%	448	(State Mean = 3.9)	(State Mean = 2.0)
Grade 8				
Improvement	8.1%	37	5.2	2.7
No Difference	2.8%	13	5.0	2.5
Deterioration	2.4%	11	5.2	2.7
No Change in Introduction	86.7%	398	5.0	2.5
TOTAL	100.0%	459	(State Mean = 5.1)	(State Mean = 2.5)
Grade 11				
Improvement	31.5%	141	5.1	3.0
No Difference	11.2%	50	4.6	2.8
Deterioration	1.1%	5	3.9	2.4
No Change in Introduction	56.2%	251	4.8	2.9
TOTAL	100.0%	447	(State Mean = 4.8)	(State Mean = 2.7)

6. Endings

Evidence of changing conclusion.

Grades 5, 8, and 11

EFFECT OF CHANGING CONCLUSION ON FINAL DRAFT	Percent of Responses	Number of Responses	Mean Holistic Score, Ex. #2	Mean Primary Trait Score, Ex. #2
Grade 5				
Improvement	8.5%	38	4.1	2.0
No Difference	17.2%	77	3.9	2.0
Deterioration	1.6%	7	3.3	2.0
No Change in Conclusion	72.8%	326	3.9	2.0
TOTAL	100.1%	448	(State Mean = 3.9)	(State Mean = 2.0)
Grade 8				
Improvement	8.3%	38	5.3	2.7
No Difference	12.4%	57	5.0	2.5
Deterioration	3.5%	16	4.4	2.3
No Change in Conclusion	75.8%	348	5.0	2.5
TOTAL	100.0%	459	(State Mean = 5.1)	(State Mean = 2.5)
Grade 11				
Improvement	40.3%	180	5.1	3.0
No Difference	15.7%	70	4.6	2.7
Deterioration	3.8%	17	3.8	2.5
No Change in Conclusion	40.3%	180	4.8	2.9
TOTAL	100.1%	447	(State Mean = 4.8)	(State Mean = 2.7)

7. Reorganizing

Evidence of recognizable structural changes in paragraphing to reorganize thought process of essay. Creation of topic sentence in paragraph organization.

Grades 5, 8, and 11

EFFECT OF REORGANIZING ON FINAL DRAFT	Percent of Responses	Number of Responses	Mean Holistic Score, Ex. #2	Mean Primary Trait Score, Ex. #2
Grade 5				
Improvement	8.0%	36	4.3	2.3
No Difference	9.6%	43	4.2	2.1
Deterioration	.2%	1	1.5	1.0
No Evidence of Reorganizing	82.1%	368	3.9	2.0
TOTAL	99.9%	448	(State Mean = 3.9)	(State Mean = 2.0)
Grade 8				
Improvement	13.9%	64	5.4	2.8
No Difference	6.8%	31	5.2	2.6
Deterioration	1.1%	5	5.3	2.8
No Evidence of Reorganizing	78.2%	359	4.9	2.5
TOTAL	100.0%	459	(State Mean = 5.1)	(State Mean = 2.5)
Grade 11				
Improvement	36.0%	161	5.2	3.0
No Difference	10.1%	45	4.4	2.8
Deterioration	2.2%	10	4.0	2.4
No Evidence of Reorganizing	51.7%	231	4.7	2.9
TOTAL	100.0%	447	(State Mean = 4.8)	(State Mean = 2.7)

8. Total Extent of Revision

Evaluation scale ranking total revision effort. Amount of revision.

Grades 5, 8, and 11

OVERALL EXTENT OF REVISION	Percent of Responses	Number of Responses	Mean Holistic Score, Ex. #2	Mean Primary Trait Score, Ex. #2
Grade 5				
No Revision	17.9%	80	3.6	1.7
Minor Revision	66.4%	297	4.0	2.1
Significant Revision	14.8%	66	4.3	2.2
Radical Revision	.9%	4	3.4	1.5
TOTAL	100.0%	447	(State Mean = 3.9)	(State Mean = 2.0)
Grade 8				
No Revision	19.0%	87	4.8	2.4
MinorRevision	72.5%	333	5.0	2.5
Significant Revision	7.0%	32	5.4	2.7
Radical Revision	1.5%	7	5.0	2.4
TOTAL	100.0%	459	(State Mean = 5.1)	(State Mean = 2.5)
Grade 11				
No Revision	3.6%	16	4.6	2.8
Simple Revision	45.6%	204	4.8	2.9
1/3–1/2 Revision	31.3%	140	4.9	2.9
1/2 or More Revision	17.9%	80	5.0	3.0
Radical Revision	1.6%	7	3.5	3.0
TOTAL	99.9%	447	(State Mean = 4.8)	(State Mean = 2.7)

9. Overall Quality of Revision

Overall quality of revisions made at each grade level.

Grades 5, 8, and 11

EFFECT OF REVISION ON OVERALL QUALITY OF FINAL DRAFT	Percent of Responses	Number of Responses	Mean Holistic Score, Ex. #2	Mean Primary Trait Score, Ex. #2
Grade 5				
Improvement	26.1%	117	4.3	2.2
No Difference	53.3%	239	3.9	2.0
Deterioration	2.2%	10	3.2	1.7
No Revision	18.3%	82	3.5	1.7
TOTAL	99.9%	448	(State Mean = 3.9)	(State Mean = 2.0)
Grade 8				
Improvement	27.9%	128	5.3	2.7
No Difference	50.3%	231	4.9	2.5
Deterioration	3.7%	17	4.6	2.5
No Revision	18.1%	83	4.8	2.4
TOTAL	100.0%	459	(State Mean = 5.1)	(State Mean = 2.5)
Grade 11				
Improvement	68.5%	306	5.1	3.0
No Difference	26.4%	118	4.2	2.6
Deterioration	1.6%	7	3.2	2.1
No Revision	3.6%	16	4.6	2.8
TOTAL	100.1%	447	(State Mean = 4.8)	(State Mean = 2.7)

KINDS, EXTENT, and QUALITY OF REVISIONS MADE BY MALES and FEMALES

Prewriting

PREWRITING	Number of Responses		Percent of Responses	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
Grade 5				
Evidence of Prewriting	35	79	16.6%	32.9%
No Evidence of Prewriting	176	161	83.4%	67.1%
TOTAL	211	240	100.0%	100.0%
Grade 8				
Evidence of Prewriting	43	47	19.6%	19.6%
No Evidence of Prewriting	176	193	80.4%	80.4%
TOTAL	219	240	100.0%	100.0%
Grade 11				
Evidence of Prewriting	40	78	17.5%	34.4%
No Evidence of Prewriting	188	149	82.5%	65.6%
TOTAL	228	227	100.0%	100.0%

Total Extent of Revision

OVERALL EXTENT OF REVISION	Number of Responses		Percent of Responses	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
Grade 5				
1. No significant revision.	38	42	18.1%	17.7%
2. Some evidence of revision in fewer than half the sentences/ paragraphs.	141	156	67.1%	65.8%
3. Significant revision in more than half the sentences/paragraphs.	29	37	13.8%	15.6%
4. Radical revision; complete revamping.	2	2	1.0%	.8%
TOTAL	210	237	100.0%	99.9%
Grade 8				
1. No significant revision.	39	48	17.8%	20.0%
2. Some evidence of revision in fewer than half the sentences/ paragraphs.	158	175	72.1%	72.9%
3. Significant revision in more than half the sentences/paragraphs.	20	12	9.1%	5.0%
4. Radical revision; complete revamping.	2	5	.9%	2.1%
TOTAL	219	240	99.9%	100.0%
Grade 11				
1. No significant revision.	9	8	4.0%	3.5%
2. Simple revision.	103	106	45.4%	46.7%
3. Revision in a third to half the sentences/paragraphs.	74	68	32.6%	30.0%
4. Revision in half or more of the sentences/paragraphs.	38	41	16.7%	18.1%
5. Radical revision; complete revamping.	3	4	1.3%	1.8%
TOTAL	227	227	100.1%	100.0%

Overall Quality of Revision

OVERALL QUALITY OF REVISION	Number of Responses		Percent of Responses	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
Grade 5				
Improvement	47	70	22.3%	29.2%
No Change	120	119	56.9%	49.6%
Deterioration	5	5	2.4%	2.1%
No Evidence of Revision	39	46	18.5%	19.2%
TOTAL	211	240	100.1%	100.1%
Grade 8				
Improvement	62	66	28.3%	27.5%
No Change	109	122	49.8%	50.8%
Deterioration	11	6	5.0%	2.5%
No Evidence of Revision	37	46	16.9%	19.2%
TOTAL	219	240	100.0%	100.0%
Grade 11				
Improvement	145	165	63.6%	72.7%
No Change	69	52	30.3%	22.9%
Deterioration	5	2	2.2%	.9%
No Evidence of Revision	9	8	3.9%	3.5%
TOTAL	228	227	100.0%	100.0%

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES COMPARED WITH REVISION STUDY RESULTS

Question 1

Grade 5: About how many hours a week do you spend writing reports, stories, or poems for your English or language arts class?

Grades 8 and 11: For the English classes you are taking this year, about how many hours a week do you spend writing assignments such as reports, essays, stories, or poems?

OVERALL EXTENT OF REVISION	ANSWER CHOICES: 4 Or More Hrs.		1–3 Hrs.		Less Than 1 Hr.	
	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses
Grade 5						
1. No significant revision.	21	23.6%	31	14.0%	28	20.6%
2. Some evidence of revision in fewer than half the sentences/paragraphs.	54	60.7%	157	71.0%	85	62.5%
3. Significant revision in more than half the sentences/paragraphs.	13	14.6%	31	14.0%	22	16.2%
4. Radical revision; complete revamping.	1	1.1%	2	.9%	1	.7%
TOTAL	89	100.0%	221	99.9%	136	100.0%
Grade 8						
1. No significant revision.	9	17.6%	44	18.1%	34	20.7%
2. Some evidence of revision in fewer than half the sentences/ paragraphs.	37	72.5%	179	73.7%	116	70.7%
3. Significant revision in more than half the sentences/paragraphs.	4	7.8%	18	7.4%	10	6.1%
4. Radical revision; complete revamping.	1	2.0%	2	.8%	4	2.4%
TOTAL	51	99.9%	243	100.0%	164	99.9%
Grade 11						
1. No significant revision.	4	5.8%	9	3.4%	3	2.7%
2. Simple revision.	31	44.9%	124	46.4%	54	47.8%
3. Revision in a third to half the sentences/paragraphs.	21	30.4%	85	31.8%	33	29.2%
4. Revision in half or more of the sentences/paragraphs.	11	15.9%	46	17.2%	21	18.6%
5. Radical revision; complete revamping.	2	2.9%	3	1.1%	2	1.8%
TOTAL	69	100.0%	267	100.0%	112	100.1%

Question 1 (continued)

OVERALL QUALITY OF REVISION	ANSWER CHOICES: 4 Or More Hrs.		1-3 Hrs.		Less Than 1 Hr.	
	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses
Grade 5						
Improvement	21	23.3%	66	29.6%	30	21.9%
No Change	42	46.7%	120	53.8%	76	55.5%
Deterioration	5	5.6%	3	1.3%	2	1.5%
No Evidence of Revision	22	24.4%	34	15.2%	29	21.2%
TOTAL	90	100.0%	223	99.9%	137	100.1%
Grade 8						
Improvement	13	25.5%	70	28.8%	45	27.4%
No Change	26	51.0%	122	50.2%	82	50.0%
Deterioration	3	5.9%	9	3.7%	5	3.0%
No Evidence of Revision	9	17.6%	42	17.3%	32	19.5%
TOTAL	51	100.0%	243	100.0%	164	99.9%
Grade 11						
Improvement	45	65.2%	186	69.7%	74	65.5%
No Change	19	27.5%	68	25.5%	34	30.1%
Deterioration	1	1.4%	4	1.5%	2	1.8%
No Evidence of Revision	4	5.8%	9	3.4%	3	2.7%
TOTAL	69	99.9%	267	100.1%	113	100.1%

Question 2

Grade 5: About how many hours a week do you spend writing reports or other papers for your social studies or science classes?

Grades 8 and 11: For the English classes other than English, about how many hours a week do you spend writing assignments such as reports, essays, or stories?

ANSWER CHOICES

OVERALL EXTENT OF REVISION	4 Or More Hrs.		1–3 Hrs.		Less Than 1 Hr.	
	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses
Grade 5						
1. No significant revision.	15	20.8%	38	16.2%	27	19.4%
2. Some evidence of revision in fewer than half the sentences/paragraphs.	41	56.9%	156	66.7%	98	70.5%
3. Significant revision in more than half the sentences/paragraphs.	16	22.2%	37	15.8%	13	9.4%
4. Radical revision; complete revamping.	0	.0%	3	1.3%	1	.7%
TOTAL	72	99.9%	234	100.0%	139	100.0%
Grade 8						
1. No significant revision.	21	23.1%	35	17.5%	31	18.6%
2. Some evidence of revision in fewer than half the sentences/ paragraphs.	63	69.2%	144	72.0%	125	74.9%
3. Significant revision in more than half the sentences/paragraphs.	5	5.5%	18	9.0%	9	5.4%
4. Radical revision; complete revamping.	2	2.2%	3	1.5%	2	1.2%
TOTAL	91	100.0%	200	100.0%	167	100.1%
Grade 11						
1. No significant revision.	4	6.1%	8	3.5%	4	2.6%
2. Simple revision.	25	37.9%	110	48.7%	73	46.8%
3. Revision in a third to a half the sentences/paragraphs.	21	31.8%	66	29.2%	52	33.3%
4. Revision in half or more of the sentences/paragraphs.	14	21.2%	39	17.3%	25	16.0%
5. Radical revision; complete revamping.	2	3.0%	3	1.3%	2	1.3%
TOTAL	66	100.0%	226	100.0%	156	100.0%

Question 2 (continued)

ANSWER CHOICES

OVERALL QUALITY OF REVISION	4 Or More Hrs.		1-3 Hrs.		Less Than 1 Hr.	
	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses
Grade 5						
Improvement	19	26.4%	68	28.9%	30	21.1%
No Change	34	47.2%	122	51.9%	81	57.0%
Deterioration	3	4.2%	6	2.6%	1	.7%
No Evidence of Revision	16	22.2%	39	16.6%	30	21.1%
TOTAL	72	100.0%	235	100.0%	142	99.9%
Grade 8						
Improvement	24	26.4%	51	25.5%	53	31.7%
No Change	45	49.5%	106	53.0%	79	47.3%
Deterioration	2	2.2%	9	4.5%	6	3.6%
No Evidence of Revision	20	22.0%	34	17.0%	29	17.4%
TOTAL	91	100.1%	200	100.0%	167	100.0%
Grade 11						
Improvement	41	62.1%	157	69.5%	106	67.9%
No Change	20	30.3%	59	26.1%	42	26.9%
Deterioration	1	1.5%	2	.9%	4	2.6%
No Evidence of Revision	4	6.1%	8	3.5%	4	2.6%
TOTAL	66	100.0%	226	100.0%	156	100.0%

Question 3

Grade 5, 8, and 11: Do your teachers ask you to make outlines, list ideas, or make notes about the topic of your paper before you write?

PREWRITING	ANSWER CHOICES: Usually		Sometimes		Never	
	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses
Grade 5						
Evidence of Prewriting	41	26.5%	64	24.6%	9	25.7%
No Evidence of Prewriting	114	73.5%	196	75.4%	26	74.3%
TOTAL	155	100.0%	260	100.0%	35	100.0%
Grade 8						
Evidence of Prewriting	42	26.8%	42	15.6%	6	18.8%
No Evidence of Prewriting	115	73.2%	227	84.4%	26	81.3%
TOTAL	157	100.0%	269	100.0%	32	100.1%
Grade 11						
Evidence of Prewriting	75	31.4%	40	20.3%	1	7.7%
No Evidence of Prewriting	164	68.6%	157	79.7%	12	92.3%
TOTAL	239	100.0%	197	100.0%	13	100.0%

Question 4

Grade 5, 8, and 11: Do you write a paper more than once before you turn it in to your teachers?

ANSWER CHOICES

OVERALL EXTENT OF REVISION	Usually		Sometimes		Never	
	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses
Grade 5						
1. No significant revision.	21	16.4%	44	19.3%	14	15.9%
2. Some evidence of revision in fewer than half the sentences/paragraphs.	88	68.8%	145	63.6%	63	71.6%
3. Significant revision in more than half the sentences/paragraphs.	18	14.1%	36	15.8%	11	12.5%
4. Radical revision; complete revamping.	1	.8%	3	1.3%	0	.0%
TOTAL	128	100.1%	228	100.0%	88	100.0%
Grade 8						
1. No significant revision.	46	19.6%	33	16.5%	8	34.8%
2. Some evidence of revision in fewer than half the sentences/ paragraphs.	168	71.5%	151	75.5%	13	56.5%
3. Significant revision in more than half the sentences/paragraphs.	16	6.8%	14	7.0%	2	8.7%
4. Radical revision; complete revamping.	5	2.1%	2	1.0%	0	.0%
TOTAL	235	100.0%	200	100.0%	23	100.0%
Grade 11						
1. No significant revision.	13	4.2%	3	2.2%	0	.0%
2. Simple revision.	138	45.1%	66	49.3%	5	55.6%
3. Revision in a third to a half the sentences/paragraphs.	99	32.4%	39	29.1%	1	11.1%
4. Revision in half or more of the sentences/paragraphs.	52	17.0%	23	17.2%	3	33.3%
5. Radical revision; complete revamping.	4	1.3%	3	2.2%	0	.0%
TOTAL	306	100.0%	134	100.0%	9	100.0%

Question 4 (continued)

ANSWER CHOICES

OVERALL QUALITY OF REVISION	Usually		Sometimes		Never	
	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses
Grade 5						
Improvement	36	27.5%	56	24.5%	24	27.3%
No Change	66	50.4%	125	54.6%	47	53.4%
Deterioration	4	3.1%	3	1.3%	3	3.4%
No Evidence of Revision	25	19.1%	45	19.7%	14	15.9%
TOTAL	131	100.1%	229	100.1%	88	100.0%
Grade 8						
Improvement	74	31.5%	47	23.5%	7	30.4%
No Change	107	45.5%	112	56.0%	11	47.8%
Deterioration	9	3.8%	8	4.0%	0	.0%
No Evidence of Revision	45	19.1%	33	16.5%	5	21.7%
TOTAL	235	99.9%	200	100.0%	23	99.9%
Grade 11						
Improvement	217	70.9%	82	61.2%	6	66.7%
No Change	72	23.5%	46	34.3%	3	33.3%
Deterioration	4	1.3%	3	2.2%	0	.0%
No Evidence of Revision	13	4.2%	3	2.2%	0	.0%
TOTAL	306	99.9%	134	99.9%	9	100.0%

Question 5

Grades 5, 8, and 11: When papers are returned, do teachers correct your capitalization, spelling, or punctuation?

EFFECT OF SURFACE FEATURE CHANGES ON FINAL DRAFT	ANSWER CHOICES: Usually		Sometimes		Never	
	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses
Grade 5						
Improvement	87	27.5%	29	26.4%	7	29.2%
No Change	104	32.9%	36	32.7%	8	33.3%
Deterioration	5	1.6%	2	1.8%	2	8.3%
No Evidence of Surface Feature Changes	120	38.0%	43	39.1%	7	29.2%
TOTAL	316	100.0%	110	100.0%	24	100.0%
Grade 8						
Improvement	63	21.0%	34	23.0%	3	30.0%
No Change	36	12.0%	11	7.4%	1	10.0%
Deterioration	11	3.7%	4	2.7%	1	10.0%
No Evidence of Surface Feature Changes	190	63.3%	99	66.9%	5	50.0%
TOTAL	300	100.0%	148	100.0%	10	100.0%
Grade 11						
Improvement	175	56.5%	69	54.3%	8	66.7%
No Change	39	12.6%	18	14.2%	1	8.3%
Deterioration	4	1.3%	1	.8%	0	.0%
No Evidence of Surface Feature Changes	92	29.7%	39	30.7%	3	25.0%
TOTAL	310	100.1%	127	100.0%	12	100.0%

Question 6

Grades 5: When papers are returned, do teachers write suggestions to help you improve your paragraphs or sentences?

Grades 8 and 11: When papers are returned, do teachers make written comments for improving the ideas or content of your paper such as paragraph organization or sentence structure?

ANSWER CHOICES

OVERALL EXTENT OF REVISION	Usually		Sometimes		Never	
	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses
Grade 5						
1. No significant revision.	25	21.6%	49	18.2%	6	9.8%
2. Some evidence of revision in fewer than half the sentences/paragraphs.	77	66.4%	171	63.6%	48	78.7%
3. Significant revision in more than half the sentences/paragraphs.	13	11.2%	46	17.1%	7	11.5%
4. Radical revision; complete revamping.	1	.9%	3	1.1%	0	.0%
TOTAL	116	100.1%	269	100.0%	61	100.0%
Grade 8						
1. No significant revision.	30	16.4%	52	21.1%	5	17.9%
2. Some evidence of revision in fewer than half the sentences/ paragraphs.	137	74.9%	175	71.1%	19	67.9%
3. Significant revision in more than half the sentences/paragraphs.	13	7.1%	15	6.1%	4	14.3%
4. Radical revision; complete revamping.	3	1.6%	4	1.6%	0	.0%
TOTAL	183	100.0%	246	99.9%	28	100.1%
Grade 11						
1. No significant revision.	11	4.0%	4	2.5%	1	7.1%
2. Simple revision.	118	43.4%	84	51.5%	7	50.0%
3. Revision in a third to a half the sentences/paragraphs.	89	32.7%	46	28.2%	4	28.6%
4. Revision in half or more of the sentences/paragraphs.	48	17.6%	28	17.2%	2	14.3%
5. Radical revision; complete revamping.	6	2.2%	1	.6%	0	.0%
TOTAL	272	99.9%	163	100.0%	14	100.0%

Question 6 (continued)

ANSWER CHOICES

OVERALL QUALITY OF REVISION	Usually		Sometimes		Never	
	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses
Grade 5						
Improvement	31	26.5%	74	27.3%	12	19.4%
No Change	58	49.6%	139	51.3%	41	66.1%
Deterioration	2	1.7%	6	2.2%	2	3.2%
No Evidence of Revision	26	22.2%	52	19.2%	7	11.3%
TOTAL	117	100.0%	271	100.0%	62	100.0%
Grade 8						
Improvement	61	33.3%	59	24.0%	8	28.6%
No Change	87	47.5%	129	52.4%	14	50.0%
Deterioration	7	3.8%	8	3.3%	1	3.6%
No Evidence of Revision	28	15.3%	50	20.3%	5	17.9%
TOTAL	183	99.9%	246	100.0%	28	100.1%
Grade 11						
Improvement	192	70.6%	105	64.4%	8	57.1%
No Change	66	24.3%	50	30.7%	5	35.7%
Deterioration	3	1.1%	4	2.5%	0	.0%
No Evidence of Revision	11	4.0%	4	2.5%	1	7.1%
TOTAL	272	100.0%	163	100.1%	14	99.9%

Question 7

Grades 5, 8, and 11: When papers are returned, do teachers talk about ways to improve what you have written?

ANSWER CHOICES

OVERALL EXTENT OF REVISION	Usually		Sometimes		Never	
	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses
Grade 5						
1. No significant revision.	22	19.3%	46	16.5%	11	22.0%
2. Some evidence of revision in fewer than half the sentences/paragraphs.	74	64.9%	190	68.1%	30	60.0%
3. Significant revision in more than half the sentences/paragraphs.	16	14.0%	42	15.1%	8	16.0%
4. Radical revision; complete revamping.	2	1.8%	1	.4%	1	2.0%
TOTAL	114	100.0%	279	100.1%	50	100.0%
Grade 8						
1. No significant revision.	24	24.0%	51	18.0%	12	16.0%
2. Some evidence of revision in fewer than half the sentences/ paragraphs.	64	64.0%	208	73.5%	60	80.0%
3. Significant revision in more than half the sentences/paragraphs.	9	9.0%	20	7.1%	3	4.0%
4. Radical revision; complete revamping.	3	3.0%	4	1.4%	0	.0%
TOTAL	100	100.0%	283	100.0%	75	100.0%
Grade 11						
1. No significant revision.	3	2.2%	13	4.8%	0	.0%
2. Simple revision.	58	41.7%	126	46.7%	25	62.5%
3. Revision in a third to a half the sentences/paragraphs.	50	36.0%	83	30.7%	6	15.0%
4. Revision in half or more of the sentences/paragraphs.	27	19.4%	43	15.9%	8	20.0%
5. Radical revision; complete revamping.	1	.7%	5	1.9%	1	2.5%
TOTAL	139	100.0%	270	100.0%	40	100.0%

Question 7 (continued)

ANSWER CHOICES

OVERALL QUALITY OF REVISION	Usually		Sometimes		Never	
	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses
Grade 5						
Improvement	30	26.1%	72	25.6%	15	29.4%
No Change	58	50.4%	155	55.2%	23	45.1%
Deterioration	3	2.6%	6	2.1%	1	2.0%
No Evidence of Revision	24	20.9%	48	17.1%	12	23.5%
TOTAL	115	100.0%	281	100.0%	51	100.0%
Grade 8						
Improvement	28	28.0%	80	28.3%	20	26.7%
No Change	48	48.0%	142	50.2%	40	53.3%
Deterioration	0	.0%	13	4.6%	4	5.3%
No Evidence of Revision	24	24.0%	48	17.0%	11	14.7%
TOTAL	100	100.0%	283	100.1%	75	100.0%
Grade 11						
Improvement	96	69.1%	185	68.5%	24	60.0%
No Change	39	28.1%	68	25.2%	14	35.0%
Deterioration	1	.7%	4	1.5%	2	5.0%
No Evidence of Revision	3	2.2%	13	4.8%	0	.0%
TOTAL	139	100.1%	270	100.0%	40	100.0%

Question 8

Grades 8 and 11 (not asked at grade 5):

After papers are returned, do teachers require you to improve, revise, or edit what you have written.

OVERALL EXTENT OF REVISION	ANSWER CHOICES: Usually		Sometimes		Never	
	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses
Grade 8						
1. No significant revision.	5	8.6%	62	21.3%	20	18.3%
2. Some evidence of revision in fewer than half the sentences/ paragraphs.	48	82.8%	201	69.1%	83	76.1%
3. Significant revision in more than half the sentences/paragraphs.	3	5.2%	23	7.9%	6	5.5%
4. Radical revision; complete revamping.	2	3.4%	5	1.7%	0	.0%
TOTAL	58	100.0%	291	100.0%	109	99.9%
Grade 11						
1. No significant revision.	2	4.5%	9	3.0%	5	5.0%
2. Simple revision.	21	47.7%	133	43.8%	55	55.0%
3. Revision in a third to a half the sentences/paragraphs.	13	29.5%	102	33.6%	23	23.0%
4. Revision in half or more of the sentences/paragraphs.	6	13.6%	56	18.4%	16	16.0%
5. Radical revision; complete revamping.	2	4.5%	4	1.3%	1	1.0%
TOTAL	44	99.8%	304	100.1%	100	100.0%

Question 8 (continued)

OVERALL QUALITY OF REVISION	ANSWER CHOICES					
	Usually		Sometimes		Never	
	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses
Grade 8						
Improvement	12	20.7%	82	28.2%	34	31.2%
No Change	38	65.5%	139	47.8%	53	48.6%
Deterioration	3	5.2%	11	3.8%	3	2.8%
No Evidence of Revision	5	8.6%	59	20.3%	19	17.4%
TOTAL	58	100.0%	291	100.1%	109	100.0%
Grade 11						
Improvement	27	61.4%	205	67.4%	72	72.0%
No Change	13	29.5%	85	28.0%	23	23.0%
Deterioration	2	4.5%	5	1.6%	0	.0%
No Evidence of Revision	2	4.5%	9	3.0%	5	5.0%
TOTAL	44	99.9%	304	100.0%	100	100.0%

Question 9

Grade 5: About how many hours a week do you spend writing stories, poems, or letters just for the fun of it (not school work)?

Grades 8 and 11: About how many hours a week do you spend writing for your own enjoyment (not school assignments)?

ANSWER CHOICES

OVERALL EXTENT OF REVISION	4 Or More Hrs.		1–3 Hrs.		Less Than 1 Hr.	
	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses
Grade 5						
1. No significant revision.	7	14.9%	21	15.1%	51	19.7%
2. Some evidence of revision in fewer than half the sentences/paragraphs.	27	57.4%	98	70.5%	171	66.0%
3. Significant revision in more than half the sentences/paragraphs.	13	27.7%	18	12.9%	35	13.5%
4. Radical revision; complete revamping.	0	.0%	2	1.4%	2	.8%
TOTAL	47	100.0%	139	99.9%	259	100.0%
Grade 8						
1. No significant revision.	9	26.5%	25	18.5%	53	18.3%
2. Some evidence of revision in fewer than half the sentences/ paragraphs.	21	61.8%	96	71.1%	215	74.4%
3. Significant revision in more than half the sentences/paragraphs.	2	5.9%	11	8.1%	19	6.6%
4. Radical revision; complete revamping.	2	5.9%	3	2.2%	2	.7%
TOTAL	34	100.1%	135	99.9%	289	100.0%
Grade 11						
1. No significant revision.	2	7.4%	4	4.0%	10	3.1%
2. Simple revision.	12	44.4%	42	42.4%	155	48.0%
3. Revision in a third to a half the sentences/paragraphs.	10	37.0%	32	32.3%	97	30.0%
4. Revision in half or more of the sentences/paragraphs.	3	11.1%	19	19.2%	56	17.3%
5. Radical revision; complete revamping.	0	.0%	2	2.0%	5	1.5%
TOTAL	27	99.9%	99	99.9%	323	99.9%

Question 9 (continued)

OVERALL QUALITY OF REVISION	ANSWER CHOICES: 4 Or More Hrs.		1–3 Hrs.		Less Than 1 Hr.	
	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses
Grade 5						
Improvement	12	24.5%	35	24.8%	70	27.0%
No Change	27	55.1%	79	56.0%	132	51.0%
Deterioration	1	2.0%	3	2.1%	6	2.3%
No Evidence of Revision	9	18.4%	24	17.0%	51	19.7%
TOTAL	49	100.0%	141	99.9%	259	100.0%
Grade 8						
Improvement	6	17.6%	36	26.7%	86	29.8%
No Change	18	52.9%	69	51.1%	143	49.5%
Deterioration	1	2.9%	5	3.7%	11	3.8%
No Evidence of Revision	9	26.5%	25	18.5%	49	17.0%
TOTAL	34	99.9%	135	100.0%	289	100.1%
Grade 11						
Improvement	17	63.0%	72	72.7%	216	66.9%
No Change	8	29.6%	19	19.2%	94	29.1%
Deterioration	0	.0%	4	4.0%	3	.9%
No Evidence of Revision	2	7.4%	4	4.0%	10	3.1%
TOTAL	27	100.0%	99	99.9%	323	100.0%

Question 10

Grades 5, 8, and 11: I enjoy writing.

OVERALL EXTENT OF REVISION	ANSWER CHOICES: Strongly Agree		Agree		Uncertain		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses
Grade 5										
No significant revision.	16	13.4%	43	23.1%	15	14.0%	5	20.0%	1	11.1%
Some evidence of revision in fewer than half the sentences/paragraphs.	81	68.1%	116	62.4%	76	71.0%	16	64.0%	7	77.8%
Significant revision in more than half the sentences/ paragraphs.	20	16.8%	26	14.0%	15	14.0%	4	16.0%	1	11.1%
Radical revision; complete revamping.	2	1.7%	1	.5%	1	.9%	0	.0%	0	.0%
TOTAL	119	100.0%	186	100.0%	107	99.9%	25	100.0%	9	100.0%
Grade 8										
No significant revision.	5	11.1%	38	19.8%	32	19.9%	9	24.3%	3	13.6%
Some evidence of revision in fewer than half the sentences/paragraphs.	35	77.8%	133	69.3%	119	73.9%	26	70.3%	18	81.8%
Significant revision in more than half the sentences/ paragraphs.	4	8.9%	17	8.9%	8	5.0%	2	5.4%	1	4.5%
Radical revision; complete revamping.	1	2.2%	4	2.1%	2	1.2%	0	.0%	0	.0%
TOTAL	45	100.0%	192	100.1%	161	100.0%	37	100.0%	22	99.9%
Grade 11										
No significant revision.	0	.0%	6	3.8%	4	2.4%	5	7.5%	1	4.5%
Simple revision.	17	45.9%	78	49.4%	73	44.2%	31	46.3%	10	45.5%
Revision in a third to a half the sentences/paragraphs.	16	43.2%	42	26.6%	59	35.8%	16	23.9%	6	27.3%
Revision in half or more of the sentences/paragraphs.	3	8.1%	29	18.4%	28	17.0%	14	20.9%	4	18.2%
Radical revision; complete revamping.	1	2.7%	3	1.9%	1	.6%	1	1.5%	1	4.5%
TOTAL	37	99.9%	158	100.1%	165	100.0%	67	100.1%	22	100.0%

Question 10 (continued)

ANSWER CHOICES

OVERALL QUALITY OF REVISION	Strongly Agree		Agree		Uncertain		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses
Grade 5										
Improvement	32	26.4%	44	23.4%	32	29.9%	5	20.0%	4	44.4%
No Change	65	53.7%	97	51.6%	57	53.3%	15	60.0%	4	44.4%
Deterioration	5	4.1%	2	1.1%	3	2.8%	0	.0%	0	.0%
No Evidence of Revision	19	15.7%	45	23.9%	15	14.0%	5	20.0%	1	11.1%
TOTAL	121	99.9%	188	100.0%	107	100.0%	25	100.0%	9	99.9%
Grade 8										
Improvement	15	33.3%	51	26.6%	41	25.5%	11	29.7%	9	40.9%
No Change	23	51.1%	98	51.0%	82	50.9%	17	45.9%	10	45.5%
Deterioration	3	6.7%	6	3.1%	8	5.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%
No Evidence of Revision	4	8.9%	37	19.3%	30	18.6%	9	24.3%	3	13.6%
TOTAL	45	100.0%	192	100.0%	161	100.0%	37	99.9%	22	100.0%
Grade 11										
Improvement	31	83.8%	107	67.7%	115	69.7%	39	58.2%	13	59.1%
No Change	6	16.2%	41	25.9%	43	26.1%	23	34.3%	8	36.4%
Deterioration	0	.0%	4	2.5%	3	1.8%	0	.0%	0	.0%
No Evidence of Revision	0	.0%	6	3.8%	4	2.4%	5	7.5%	1	4.5%
TOTAL	37	100.0%	158	99.9%	165	100.0%	67	100.0%	22	100.0%

Question 11

Grades 5, 8, and 11: People seem to enjoy what I write.

OVERALL EXTENT OF REVISION	ANSWER CHOICES: Strongly Agree		Agree		Uncertain		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses
Grade 5										
No significant revision.	7	18.9%	25	15.0%	42	20.1%	2	8.3%	4	57.1%
Some evidence of revision in fewer than half the sentences/paragraphs.	23	62.2%	110	65.9%	140	67.0%	18	75.0%	3	42.9%
Significant revision in more than half the sentences/ paragraphs.	6	16.2%	29	17.4%	27	12.9%	4	16.7%	0	.0%
Radical revision; complete revamping.	1	2.7%	3	1.8%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%
TOTAL	37	100.0%	167	100.1%	209	100.0%	24	100.0%	7	100.0%
Grade 8										
No significant revision.	9	37.5%	26	19.5%	45	16.7%	7	30.4%	0	.0%
Some evidence of revision in fewer than half the sentences/paragraphs.	14	58.3%	93	69.9%	203	75.5%	14	60.9%	8	100.0%
Significant revision in more than half the sentences/ paragraphs.	1	4.2%	13	9.8%	15	5.6%	2	8.7%	0	.0%
Radical revision; complete revamping.	0	.0%	1	.8%	6	2.2%	0	.0%	0	.0%
TOTAL	24	100.0%	133	100.0%	269	100.0%	23	100.0%	8	100.0%
Grade 11										
No significant revision.	0	.0%	7	4.4%	8	3.3%	1	4.8%	0	.0%
Simple revision.	10	58.8%	74	46.5%	113	46.7%	8	38.1%	4	44.4%
Revision in a third to a half the sentences/paragraphs.	5	29.4%	50	31.4%	72	29.8%	7	33.3%	4	44.4%
Revision in half or more of the sentences/paragraphs.	2	11.8%	25	15.7%	47	19.4%	4	19.0%	0	.0%
Radical revision; complete revamping.	0	.0%	3	1.9%	2	.8%	1	4.8%	1	11.1%
TOTAL	17	100.0%	159	99.9%	242	100.0%	21	100.0%	9	99.9%

Question 11 (continued)

ANSWER CHOICES

OVERALL QUALITY OF REVISION	Strongly Agree		Agree		Uncertain		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses
Grade 5:										
Improvement	7	18.4%	58	34.3%	46	21.9%	5	20.8%	1	14.3%
No Change	21	55.3%	82	48.5%	114	54.3%	17	70.8%	2	28.6%
Deterioration	2	5.3%	2	1.2%	6	2.9%	0	.0%	0	.0%
No Evidence of Revision	8	21.1%	27	16.0%	44	21.0%	2	8.3%	4	57.1%
GRADE 5 TOTAL	38	100.1%	169	100.0%	210	100.1%	24	99.9%	7	100.0%
Grade 8:										
Improvement	4	16.7%	39	29.3%	79	29.4%	4	17.4%	1	12.5%
No Change	10	41.7%	65	48.9%	136	50.6%	12	52.2%	7	87.5%
Deterioration	2	8.3%	4	3.0%	10	3.7%	1	4.3%	0	.0%
No Evidence of Revision	8	33.3%	25	18.8%	44	16.4%	6	26.1%	0	.0%
GRADE 8 TOTAL	24	100.0%	133	100.0%	269	100.1%	23	100.0%	8	100.0%
Grade 11:										
Improvement	14	82.4%	119	74.8%	155	64.0%	12	57.1%	4	44.4%
No Change	2	11.8%	31	19.5%	75	31.0%	8	38.1%	5	55.6%
Deterioration	1	5.9%	2	1.3%	4	1.7%	0	.0%	0	.0%
No Evidence of Revision	0	.0%	7	4.4%	8	3.3%	1	4.8%	0	.0%
GRADE 11 TOTAL	17	100.1%	159	100.0%	242	100.0%	21	100.0%	9	100.0%

Question 12

Grade 5: Writing seems to be a waste of time.

Grades 8 and 11: Expressing ideas through writing seems to be a waste of time.

ANSWER CHOICES

OVERALL EXTENT OF REVISION	Strongly Agree		Agree		Uncertain		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	No. of Re-sponses	% of Responses	No. of Re-sponses	% of Responses	No. of Re-sponses	% of Responses	No. of Re-sponses	% of Responses	No. of Re-sponses	% of Responses
Grade 5										
No significant revision.	2	20.0%	2	9.5%	9	17.6%	32	20.4%	34	16.7%
Some evidence of revision in fewer than half the sentences/paragraphs.	6	60.0%	13	61.9%	37	72.5%	101	64.3%	138	67.6%
Significant revision in more than half the sentences/ paragraphs.	2	20.0%	6	28.6%	5	9.8%	24	15.3%	28	13.7%
Radical revision; complete revamping.	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	4	2.0%
TOTAL	10	100.0%	21	100.0%	51	99.9%	157	100.0%	204	100.0%
Grade 8										
No significant revision.	4	26.7%	7	17.9%	17	18.3%	42	19.1%	17	18.9%
Some evidence of revision in fewer than half the sentences/paragraphs.	11	73.3%	30	76.9%	68	73.1%	158	71.8%	65	72.2%
Significant revision in more than half the sentences/ paragraphs.	0	.0%	2	5.1%	5	5.4%	16	7.3%	8	8.9%
Radical revision; complete revamping.	0	.0%	0	.0%	3	3.2%	4	1.8%	0	.0%
TOTAL	15	100.0%	39	99.9%	93	100.0%	220	100.0%	90	100.0%
Grade 11										
No significant revision.	0	.0%	0	.0%	6	7.9%	6	2.7%	4	4.1%
Simple revision,	3	20.0%	16	44.4%	35	46.1%	111	49.6%	44	44.9%
Revision in a third to a half the sentences/paragraphs.	10	66.7%	11	30.6%	28	36.8%	59	26.3%	31	31.6%
Revision in half or more of the sentences/paragraphs.	1	6.7%	9	25.0%	6	7.9%	45	20.1%	17	17.3%
Radical revision; comple e revamping.	1	6.7%	0	.0%	1	1.3%	3	1.3%	2	2.0%
TOTAL	15	100.1%	36	100.0%	76	100.0%	224	100.0%	98	99.9%

Question 12 (continued)

ANSWER CHOICES

OVERALL QUALITY OF REVISION	Strongly Agree		Agree		Uncertain		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses
Grade 5										
Improvement	5	50.0%	5	23.8%	10	19.6%	47	29.7%	49	23.7%
No Change	3	30.0%	14	66.7%	30	58.8%	77	48.7%	113	54.6%
Deterioration	0	.0%	0	.0%	2	3.9%	1	.6%	7	3.4%
No Evidence of Revision	2	20.0%	2	9.5%	9	17.6%	33	20.9%	38	18.4%
TOTAL	10	100.0%	21	100.0%	51	99.9%	158	99.9%	207	100.1%
Grade 8										
Improvement	5	33.3%	15	38.5%	23	24.7%	61	27.7%	23	25.6%
No Change	6	40.0%	15	38.5%	50	53.8%	110	50.0%	49	54.4%
Deterioration	0	.0%	2	5.1%	3	3.2%	9	4.1%	3	3.3%
No Evidence of Revision	4	26.7%	7	17.9%	17	18.3%	40	18.2%	15	16.7%
TOTAL	15	100.0%	39	100.0%	93	100.0%	220	100.0%	90	100.0%
Grade 11										
Improvement	8	53.3%	21	58.3%	50	65.8%	150	67.0%	76	77.6%
No Change	7	46.7%	13	36.1%	20	26.3%	63	28.1%	18	18.4%
Deterioration	0	.0%	2	5.6%	0	.0%	5	2.2%	0	.0%
No Evidence of Revision	0	.0%	0	.0%	6	7.9%	6	2.7%	4	4.1%
TOTAL	15	100.0%	36	100.0%	76	100.0%	224	100.0%	98	100.1%

Question 13

Grades 5, 8, and 11: I think that I'm a good writer.

OVERALL EXTENT OF REVISION	ANSWER CHOICES: Strongly Agree		Agree		Uncertain		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses
Grade 5										
No significant revision.	8	12.5%	33	17.8%	26	18.6%	8	20.0%	3	23.1%
Some evidence of revision in fewer than half the sentences/paragraphs.	45	70.3%	122	65.9%	94	67.1%	26	65.0%	7	53.8%
Significant revision in more than half the sentences/ paragraphs.	10	15.6%	27	14.6%	20	14.3%	6	15.0%	3	23.1%
Radical revision; complete revamping.	1	1.6%	3	1.6%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%
TOTAL	64	100.0%	185	99.9%	140	100.0%	40	100.0%	13	100.0%
Grade 8										
No significant revision.	6	24.0%	33	22.4%	38	18.8%	8	13.1%	2	9.1%
Some evidence of revision in fewer than half the sentences/paragraphs.	16	64.0%	107	72.8%	144	71.3%	47	77.0%	18	81.8%
Significant revision in more than half the sentences/ paragraphs.	2	8.0%	7	4.8%	15	7.4%	5	8.2%	2	9.1%
Radical revision; complete revamping.	1	4.0%	0	.0%	5	2.5%	1	1.6%	0	.0%
TOTAL	25	100.0%	147	100.0%	202	100.0%	61	99.9%	22	100.0%
Grade 11										
No significant revision.	0	.0%	5	3.1%	6	3.2%	5	7.5%	0	.0%
Simple revision.	12	57.1%	79	48.5%	85	45.5%	28	41.8%	5	45.5%
Revision in a third to a half the sentences/paragraphs.	5	23.8%	49	30.1%	58	31.0%	23	34.3%	4	36.4%
Revision in half or more of the sentences/paragraphs.	4	19.0%	25	15.3%	37	19.8%	11	16.4%	1	9.1%
Radical revision; complete revamping.	0	.0%	5	3.1%	1	.5%	0	.0%	1	9.1%
TOTAL	21	99.9%	163	100.1%	187	100.0%	67	100.0%	11	100.1%

Question 13 (continued)

ANSWER CHOICES

OVERALL QUALITY OF REVISION	Strongly Agree		Agree		Uncertain		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses
Grade 5										
Improvement	23	35.4%	51	27.6%	33	23.1%	6	15.0%	3	23.1%
No Change	31	47.7%	96	51.9%	77	53.8%	26	65.0%	7	53.8%
Deterioration	2	3.1%	4	2.2%	4	2.8%	0	.0%	0	.0%
No Evidence of Revision	9	13.8%	34	18.4%	29	20.3%	8	20.0%	3	23.1%
TOTAL	65	100.0%	185	100.1%	143	100.0%	40	100.0%	13	100.0%
Grade 8										
Improvement	7	28.0%	38	25.9%	59	29.2%	19	31.1%	4	18.2%
No Change	11	44.0%	71	48.3%	100	49.5%	32	52.5%	16	72.7%
Deterioration	2	8.0%	6	4.1%	6	3.0%	3	4.9%	0	.0%
No Evidence of Revision	5	20.0%	32	21.8%	37	18.3%	7	11.5%	2	9.1%
TOTAL	25	100.0%	147	100.1%	202	100.0%	61	100.0%	22	100.0%
Grade 11										
Improvement	17	81.0%	121	74.2%	125	66.8%	38	56.7%	4	36.4%
No Change	4	19.0%	35	21.5%	52	27.8%	23	34.3%	7	63.6%
Deterioration	0	.0%	2	1.2%	4	2.1%	1	1.5%	0	.0%
No Evidence of Revision	0	.0%	5	3.1%	6	3.2%	5	7.5%	0	.0%
TOTAL	21	100.0%	163	100.0%	187	99.9%	67	100.0%	11	100.1%

Question 14

Grades 5, 8, and 11: I avoid writing.

ANSWER CHOICES

OVERALL EXTENT OF REVISION	Strongly Agree		Agree		Uncertain		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses
Grade 5										
No significant revision.	0	.0%	3	11.5%	18	25.7%	35	19.9%	22	14.2%
Some evidence of revision in fewer than half the sentences/paragraphs.	10	71.4%	19	73.1%	42	60.0%	112	63.6%	110	71.0%
Significant revision in more than half the sentences/ paragraphs.	4	28.6%	4	15.4%	10	14.3%	28	15.9%	20	12.9%
Radical revision; complete revamping.	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	.6%	3	1.9%
TOTAL	14	100.0%	26	100.0%	70	100.0%	176	100.0%	155	100.0%
Grade 8										
No significant revision.	3	18.8%	8	14.5%	18	20.9%	43	19.4%	14	19.4%
Some evidence of revision in fewer than half the sentences/paragraphs.	12	75.0%	42	76.4%	62	72.1%	164	73.9%	49	68.1%
Significant revision in more than half the sentences/ paragraphs.	1	6.3%	4	7.3%	4	4.7%	13	5.9%	7	9.7%
Radical revision; complete revamping.	0	.0%	1	1.8%	2	2.3%	2	.9%	2	2.8%
TOTAL	16	100.1%	55	100.0%	86	100.0%	222	100.1%	72	100.0%
Grade 11										
No significant revision.	0	.0%	3	4.0%	4	4.0%	6	3.2%	2	3.8%
Simple revision.	9	45.0%	36	48.0%	46	45.5%	90	47.9%	22	41.5%
Revision in a third to a half the sentences/paragraphs.	8	40.0%	24	32.0%	32	31.7%	54	28.7%	17	32.1%
Revision in half or more of the sentences/paragraphs.	2	10.0%	11	14.7%	19	18.8%	35	18.6%	10	18.9%
Radical revision; complete revamping.	1	5.0%	1	1.3%	0	.0%	3	1.6%	2	3.8%
TOTAL	20	100.0%	75	100.0%	101	100.0%	188	100.0%	53	100.1%

Question 11 (continued)

ANSWER CHOICES

OVERALL QUALITY OF REVISION	Strongly Agree		Agree		Uncertain		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses	No. of Responses	% of Responses
Grade 5										
Improvement	7	50.0%	11	42.3%	11	15.7%	47	26.4%	40	25.5%
No Change	7	50.0%	12	46.2%	39	55.7%	89	50.0%	89	56.7%
Deterioration	0	.0%	0	.0%	2	2.9%	4	2.2%	4	2.5%
No Evidence of Revision	0	.0%	3	11.5%	18	25.7%	38	21.3%	24	15.3%
TOTAL	14	100.0%	26	100.0%	70	100.0%	178	99.9%	157	100.0%
Grade 8										
Improvement	6	37.5%	19	34.5%	18	20.9%	63	28.4%	18	25.0%
No Change	7	43.8%	27	49.1%	48	55.8%	108	48.6%	38	52.8%
Deterioration	0	.0%	1	1.8%	3	3.5%	9	4.1%	4	5.6%
No Evidence of Revision	3	18.8%	8	14.5%	17	19.8%	42	18.9%	12	16.7%
TOTAL	16	100.1%	55	99.9%	86	100.0%	222	100.0%	72	100.0%
Grade 11										
Improvement	14	70.0%	45	60.0%	66	65.3%	132	70.2%	41	77.4%
No Change	6	30.0%	27	36.0%	28	27.7%	46	24.5%	10	18.9%
Deterioration	0	.0%	0	.0%	3	3.0%	4	2.1%	0	.0%
No Evidence of Revision	0	.0%	3	4.0%	4	4.0%	6	3.2%	2	3.8%
TOTAL	20	100.0%	75	100.0%	101	100.0%	188	100.0%	53	100.1%